



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/709,916	11/09/2000	Dragan Sretenovic	1521-190	3667
570	7590	07/11/2005	EXAMINER	
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD L.L.P. ONE COMMERCE SQUARE 2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/709,916	SRETENOVIC, DRAGAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thong H. Vu	2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 10-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 10-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

1. Claims 1-9 are canceled. Claims 10-26 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-10, filed 6/17/05, with respect to Nelson-Perill have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Ankireddipally and Bowen references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 10-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ankireddipally et al [Ankireddipally, 6,772,216 B1].
4. As per claim 10, Ankireddipally discloses a method using a computer system for automatically presenting values of variables from a selected type of device to a user interface in a human-understandable language, the system including a data engine for interfacing with a data dictionary containing information for translating the values of the variables in the native language of the device into the human-understandable language, and a data agent which is connected to the device, the method comprising the steps of:

requesting by the data engine (i.e.: a software module such as XML) from the data dictionary names of variables associated with the selected type of device [Ankireddipally, XML referred to as dictionaries, col 2 line 45-col 3 line 5];

obtaining, by the data agent (i.e.: software, application), based on the selected type of device values of the variables [Ankireddipally, application-to-application interaction includes selecting application programs on the list from one of the plurality of computers, col 8 lines 43-col 9 line 25];

obtaining, by the data engine, from the data agent, the values obtained by the data agent (i.e.: name-value pair) [Ankireddipally, name-value pair, col 5 lines 1-17];

obtaining from the data dictionary the translating information [Ankireddipally, XML translation, col 12 lines 49-63; col 15 lines 39-57, converting structured documents received, col 27 lines 30-40];

presenting, by the data engine, to the user interface, the translated values in the human-understandable language [Ankireddipally, viewed by a user, col 25 lines 5-15].

translating, by the data engine, the obtained values into the human-understandable language (i.e.: GUI,HTML) using the translating information obtained from the data dictionary [Ankireddipally, HTML document, col 25 lines 5-15];

5. As per claim 11, Ankireddipally discloses automatically communicating with a data central (i.e.: database) which is external to the system, for obtaining the names of variables associated with the type of the device and the language of the type of the device when after communicating with the data dictionary the names of the-variables

Art Unit: 2142

and/or the language of the type of the device are not available from the data dictionary, in order to facilitate translation of the values into the human-understandable language [database server, col 13 lines 1-10].

6. As per claim 12, Ankireddipally discloses automatically storing, in the data dictionary, the names of the variables associated with the type of the device and the language of the type of the device obtained from the first data central [Ankireddipally, name-value pair, col 5 lines 1-17].

7. As per claims 13,22 contain the similar limitations set forth in claim 10. Therefore claims 13,22 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 10.

8. As per claim 15, Ankireddipally discloses establishing communication between the data dictionary and the data central is via a hyper-text markup language link [Ankireddipally, HTML document, col 25 lines 5-15].

As per claim 16, Ankireddipally discloses communicating with the data dictionary to obtain the names of the variables associated with the type of the device [Ankireddipally, name-value pair, col 5 lines 1-17].

9. As per claim 17, Ankireddipally discloses establishing communication with the device to obtain values of the variables associated with the type of the device [Ankireddipally, name-value pair, col 5 lines 1-17].

10. As per claim 18, Ankireddipally discloses translating the names and the values of the variables into a language understandable by a human [Ankireddipally, name-value pair, col 5 lines 1-17].

11. As per claims 19-21 contain the similar limitations set forth in claims 14-16. Therefore claims 19-21 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 14-16.

12. As per claims 23-25 contain the similar limitations set forth in claims 19,15,17 respectively. Therefore claims 23-25 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 19,15,17.

13. As per claim 26, Ankireddipally discloses the data dictionary and/or the data central are adapted to provide the names of the variables based upon a selected variable key [Ankireddipally, name-value pair, col 5 lines 1-17].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

14. Claims 10-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bowen et al [Bowen, 6,094,649].

15. As per claim 10, Bowen discloses a method using a computer system for automatically presenting values of variables from a selected type of device to a user interface in a human-understandable language, the system including a data engine for interfacing with a data dictionary containing information for translating the values of the variables in the native language of the device into the human-understandable language, and a data agent which is connected to the device, the method comprising the steps of:

requesting by the data engine (i.e.: the structured database) from the data dictionary names of variables associated with the selected type of device [Bowen, database in relations according to a data dictionary, col 7 line 52-col 8 line18];

obtaining, by the data agent, based on the selected type of device values of the variables [Bowen, indexing agent data value, col 8 lines 31-51; select values, col 11 lines 12-26];

obtaining, by the data engine, from the data agent, the values obtained by the data agent [Bowen, keys values, col 9 lines 24-38];

obtaining from the data dictionary the translating information [Bowen, data type conversion, col 12 lines 42-60];

translating, by the data engine, the obtained values into the human-understandable language (i.e.: GUI, HTML) using the translating information obtained from the data dictionary [Bowen, HTML, converted and displayed, col 16 lines 30-40]; presenting, by the data engine, to the user interface, the translated values in the human-understandable language [Bowen, HTML, converted and displayed, col 16 lines 30-40].

16. As per claim 11, Bowen discloses automatically communicating with a data central (i.e.: database) which is external to the system, for obtaining the names of variables associated with the type of the device and the language of the type of the device when after communicating with the data dictionary the names of the variables and/or the language of the type of the device are not available from the data dictionary, in order to facilitate translation of the values into the human-understandable language [Bowen, col 12 lines 16-28].

17. As per claim 12, Bowen discloses automatically storing, in the data dictionary, the names of the variables associated with the type of the device and the language of the type of the device obtained from the first data central [Bowen, col 12 lines 16-28].

18. As per claims 13,22 contain the similar limitations set forth in claim 10. Therefore claims 13,22 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 10.

Art Unit: 2142

19. As per claim 15, Bowen discloses establishing communication between the data dictionary and the data central is via a hyper-text markup language link [Bowen, HTML, converted and displayed, col 16 lines 30-40].

20. As per claim 16, Bowen discloses communicating with the data dictionary to obtain the names of the variables associated with the type of the device [Bowen, name and type, col 11 lines 1-10].

21. As per claim 17, Bowen discloses establishing communication with the device to obtain values of the variables associated with the type of the device as inherent feature of selecting attributes [Bowen, col 15 lines 10-32].

22. As per claim 18, Bowen discloses translating the names and the values of the variables into a language understandable by a human [Bowen, HTML, converted and displayed, col 16 lines 30-40].

23. As per claims 19-21 contain the similar limitations set forth in claims 14-16. Therefore claims 19-21 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 14-16.

24. As per claims 23-25 contain the similar limitations set forth in claims 19,15,17 respectively. Therefore claims 23-25 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 19,15,17.

25. As per claim 26, Bowen discloses the data dictionary and/or the data central are adapted to provide the names of the variables based upon a selected variable key [Bowen, name and type, col 11 lines 1-10].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell*, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

